REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of November 3, 2009 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claim 18 was previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 20 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-17, 19, and 20 are pending upon entry of the present paper. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 13, 15-17, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/22792 to Pirot ("Pirot"), WO 01/97546 to Kang ("Kang"), and Examiner's Official Notice ("Official Notice"). Claims 4 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pirot, Kang, and Official Notice, in view of "Voice, Call-Handling Systems Move Beyond Simple Switching" to Powell ("Voice"). Claims 6-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pirot, Kang, and Official Notice, in view of U.S. pat. no. 6,615,260 to Honda et al. ("Honda"). These rejections are traversed below.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, "wherein classifying the calls further include: sorting a call according to a source site of the call, for each group of calls sorted based on the source site, further sorting the call according to the called number."

The Office Action at pages 3-4 contends that the above-noted features recited in claim 1 related to classifying calls includes sorting a call according to a source site of the call, and for each group of calls sorted based on the source site, further sorting the call according to the called number are inherently performed in Pirot. Applicants disagree. Indeed, under the doctrine of inherency, the allegedly inherent characteristic must necessarily flow from the teachings of the reference; the fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. MPEP § 2112. The above-noted features recited in claim 1 related to classifying calls, including sorting a call according to a source site of the call, and for each group of calls sorted based on the source site, further sorting the call according to the called number are not necessarily performed in Pirot because Pirot does not describe classifying calls based on a pairing of source and destination. As such, because the

above-noted features do not necessarily flow from Pirot, Pirot does not inherently describe features related to classifying calls includes sorting a call according to a source site of the call, and for each group of calls sorted based on the source site, further sorting the call according to the called number. Claim 1 is distinguishable over Pirot for at least these reasons.

Notwithstanding whether the proposed combination of Kang, Official Notice, and Pirot is proper, Kang and Official Notice fail to remedy the deficiencies of Pirot described above. As such, claim 1 is distinguishable over the alleged combination of references.

Amended independent claim 19 recites features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. Claim 19 is distinguishable from the references for at least reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 13, and 15-17 depend from claim 1 and are distinguishable from the references for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 4 and 6-14 are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 from which they depend because Voice and Honda fail to remedy the deficiencies of Pirot, Kang, and Official Notice described above with respect to claim 1 (notwithstanding whether the alleged combinations of references would have been proper).

The referenced dependent claims are further distinguishable in view of the features recited therein. For example, claim 4 recites "wherein said classification module is configured to classify the internal calls over said corporate telecommunications network according to in-site calls and between-site calls." The Office Action at page 6 correctly indicates that Pirot, Kang, and Official Notice fail to describe such features. The Office Action at page 6 asserts that Voice at col. 1, paragraph 2 demonstrates that it is old and well known in the art of telecommunications to have different classifications for internal calls because Voice describes that corporate networks can handle call-by-call service selection, automatic calling number identification, call distribution, conferencing, trunk allocations, voice mail, and call accounting on a local, regional, or national basis – as if all parties were on a single local network. Even assuming (without admitting) that the treatment of the various services described in Voice as if they were on a single local network could appropriately be analogized to the internal calls of claim 4, Voice fails to teach or suggest a classification module configured to classify those services (e.g., the alleged

internal calls) according to in-site calls and between-site calls as recited in claim 4. Claim 4 is further distinguishable over the references for at least these reasons.

New Claim

Claim 20 is new. While claim 20 has not been examined to date, the following remarks are provided in order to expedite the prosecution.

Illustrative, non-limiting written description support for the features recited in claim 20 may be found in the filed specification when read as a whole, and for example, at page 25, line 20 – page 26, line 9.

Claim 20 depends from claim 19 and is distinguishable over the references of record for at least the same reasons as claim 19. Claim 20 is further distinguishable over the references of record, as the references are completely silent with respect to the features recited in claim 20.

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: January 26, 2010

By: /Gary D. Fedorochko/
Gary D. Fedorochko
Registration No. 35,509

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001